

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN
MILWAUKEE DIVISION**

WILLIAM LINDALA, Individually and on Behalf)	Case No.: 19-cv-1696	
of All Others Similarly Situated,)	
)	CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT
Plaintiff,)	
v.)	
)	Jury Trial Demanded
HALSTED FINANCIAL SERVICES, LLC,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

INTRODUCTION

1. This class action seeks redress for collection practices that violate the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1692 *et seq.* (the “FDCPA”), and the Wisconsin Consumer Act, chapter 427, Wisconsin Statutes (the “WCA”).

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

2. The court has jurisdiction to grant the relief sought by the Plaintiff pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k, and 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1337, and 1367. Venue in this District is proper in that Defendant directed its collection efforts into the District.

PARTIES

3. Plaintiff William Lindala is an individual who resides in the Eastern District of Wisconsin (Milwaukee County).

4. Plaintiff is a “consumer” as defined in the FDCPA, 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(3), in that Defendant sought to collect from Plaintiff a debt incurred for personal, family, or household purposes.

5. Plaintiff is also a “customer” as defined in the Wisconsin Consumer Act, Wis. Stat. § 421.301(17), in that he engaged in a consumer credit transaction.

6. Defendant Halsted Financial Services, LLC (“Halsted”) is a foreign limited liability company with its principal place of business located at 8001 North Lincoln Avenue, Suite 500, Skokie, Illinois 60077.

7. Halsted is engaged in the business of a collection agency, using the mails and telephone to collect consumer debts originally owed to others.

8. Halsted is engaged in the business of collecting debts owed to others and incurred for personal, family or household purposes.

9. Halsted is a debt collector as defined in 15 U.S.C. § 1692a and Wis. Stat. § 427.103(3).

FACTS

10. On or about March 20, 2019, Halsted mailed a debt collection letter to Plaintiff regarding an alleged debt owed to “LVNV Funding LLC,” with an “Original Creditor” listed as “CREDIT ONE BANK, N.A.” A copy of this letter is attached to this complaint as Exhibit A.

11. Upon information and belief, the alleged debt referenced in Exhibit A was incurred by use of a credit card, which was used only for personal, family, or household purposes.

12. Upon information and belief, Exhibit A is a form letter, generated by computer, and with the information specific to Plaintiff inserted by computer.

13. Upon information and belief, Exhibit A is a form debt collection letter used by Halsted to attempt to collect alleged debts.

14. Upon information and belief, Exhibit A was the first written communication Plaintiff received from Halsted regarding the alleged debt referenced in Exhibit A.

15. Exhibit A contains the validation notice that the FDCPA, 15 U.S.C. § 1692g, requires debt collectors to provide along with their initial communications:

This communication is from a debt collector. This is an attempt to collect a debt and any information obtained will be used for that purpose. Unless you notify this office within 30 days after receiving this notice that you dispute the validity of the debt or any portion thereof, this office will assume this debt is valid. If you notify this office in writing within 30 days after receiving this notice that you dispute the validity of this debt or any portion thereof, this office will obtain verification of the debt or obtain a copy of a judgment and mail you a copy of such judgment or verification. If you request from this office in writing within 30 days after receiving this notice, this office will provide you with the name and address of the original creditor, if different than the current creditor.

16. Additionally, Exhibit A includes the following statement:

Please note that a negative credit bureau report reflecting on your credit record may be submitted to a credit reporting agency by the current account owner if you fail to fulfill the terms of your credit obligations. This notice in no way affects any rights you may have.

17. On or about May 10, 2019, Halsted mailed another debt collection letter to Plaintiff regarding the same alleged debt owed to “LVNV Funding LLC.” with A copy of this letter is attached to this complaint as Exhibit B.

18. Upon information and belief, Exhibit B is another form letter, of the same form as Exhibit A.

19. Like Exhibit A, Exhibit B includes the following statement:

Please note that a negative credit bureau report reflecting on your credit record may be submitted to a credit reporting agency by the current account owner if you fail to fulfill the terms of your credit obligations. This notice in no way affects any rights you may have.

20. The unsophisticated consumer would understand the representation that “a negative credit report reflecting on your credit record may be submitted to a credit reporting agency if you fail to fulfill the terms of your credit obligation” to be a representation that Halsted and/or the creditor would in fact report their alleged debt as delinquent to a credit reporting agency (“CRA”) if they failed to tender payment as demanded by the collection letter. *See, e.g., Lox v. CDA, Ltd.*, 689 F.3d 818, 825 (7th Cir. 2012) (citing *Gonzales v. Arrow Fin. Servs., LLC*,

660 F.3d 1055, 1063 (9th Cir. 2011)); *Cooper v. Retrieval-Masters Credit Bureau, Inc.*, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 84693, *7, 2017 WL 2404952 (N.D. Ill. June 2, 2017).

21. Similarly, the unsophisticated consumer would understand the statement “a negative credit report reflecting on your credit record may be submitted to a credit reporting agency if you fail to fulfill the terms of your credit obligations” be a representation that Halsted and/or the creditor had not yet reported their alleged debt as delinquent to any CRA and that such a negative credit report could be avoided if they tendered payment as demanded by the collection letter, Exhibit A. See, e.g., *Johnson v. Enhanced Recovery Co., LLC*, 228 F. Supp. 3d 870 (N.D. Ind. 2017).

22. By sending a series of collection letters which state “a negative credit report reflecting on your credit record may be submitted to a credit reporting agency if you fail to fulfill the terms of your credit obligations” Halsted is engaging in communications to the consumer in connection with the collection of a debt which include representations that are false, deceptive, and misleading.

23. After Halsted sent Plaintiff Exhibit A, Halsted and/or the creditor of Plaintiff’s alleged debt either did or did not report such debt to CRAs prior to sending Exhibit B, which was mailed almost two months later than the initial letter.

24. If Halsted and/or the creditor did not report the alleged debt to any CRA between sending Exhibits A & B, the representation included in Exhibit A that “a negative credit report reflecting on your credit record may be submitted to a credit reporting agency if you fail to fulfill the terms of your credit obligations” constitutes a false, deceptive, and misleading threat.

25. Conversely, if Halsted and/or the creditor did indeed report the alleged debt to any CRA, the representation included in Exhibit B that “a negative credit report reflecting on your

credit record may be submitted to a credit reporting agency if you fail to fulfill the terms of your credit obligations” constitutes a false, deceptive, and misleading representation because the unsophisticated consumer would understand such a representation to indicate that a negative credit report could be avoided if they tendered payment as demanded by the subsequent letter.

26. False, deceptive, and misleading representations regarding credit reporting are material misrepresentations:

Credit reports matter, and damage to one’s report can occur in a moment but take a decade or more to repair. [...] Consumers with debts in collection are generally people doing their best in the face of a tough situation that requires them to make difficult choices. “[T]here is universal agreement among scholars, law enforcement officials, and even debt collectors that the number of persons who willfully refuse to pay just debts is minuscule. The vast majority of consumers who obtain credit fully intend to repay their debts.” By offering (or appearing to offer) a consumer a way to keep one delinquency off her credit report, a debt collector might get itself bumped to the top of her list of payments to make. That makes the offer material...

Johnson, 228 F. Supp. 3d at 878 (internal citations omitted).

27. Plaintiff misled and confused by Exhibits A & B.

28. The unsophisticated consumer would be misled and confused by Exhibits A & B.

The FDCPA

29. The FDCPA creates substantive rights for consumers; violations cause injury to consumers, and such injuries are concrete and particularized. *Derosia v. Credit Corp. Solutions*, 2018 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 50016, *12, 2018 WL 1513043 (E.D. Wis. March 27, 2018); *Pogorzelski v. Patenaude & Felix APC*, No. 16-C-1330, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 89678 *9 (E.D. Wis. June 12, 2017) (“A plaintiff who receives misinformation from a debt collector has suffered the type of injury the FDCPA was intended to protect against.”); *Spuhler v. State Collection Servs.*, No. 16-CV-1149, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 177631 (E.D. Wis. Oct. 26, 2017) (“As in *Pogorzelski*, the

Spuhlers’ allegations that the debt collection letters sent by State Collection contained false representations of the character, amount, or legal status of a debt in violation of their rights under the FDCPA sufficiently pleads a concrete injury-in-fact for purposes of standing.”); *Bock v. Pressler & Pressler, LLP*, No. 11-7593, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 81058 *21 (D.N.J. May 25, 2017) (“through [s]ection 1692e of the FDCPA, Congress established ‘an enforceable right to truthful information concerning’ debt collection practices, a decision that ‘was undoubtedly influenced by congressional awareness that the intentional provision of misinformation’ related to such practices, ‘contribute[s] to the number of personal bankruptcies, to marital instability, to the loss of jobs, and to invasions of individual privacy,’”); *Quinn v. Specialized Loan Servicing, LLC*, No. 16 C 2021, 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 107299 *8-13 (N.D. Ill. Aug. 11, 2016) (rejecting challenge to Plaintiff’s standing based upon alleged FDCPA statutory violation); *Lane v. Bayview Loan Servicing, LLC*, No. 15 C 10446, 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 89258 *9-10 (N.D. Ill. July 11, 2016) (“When a federal statute is violated, and especially when Congress has created a cause of action for its violation, by definition Congress has created a legally protected interest that it deems important enough for a lawsuit.”); *see also Mogg v. Jacobs*, No. 15-CV-1142-JPG-DGW, 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 33229, 2016 WL 1029396, at *5 (S.D. Ill. Mar. 15, 2016) (“Congress does have the power to enact statutes creating legal rights, the invasion of which creates standing, even though no injury would exist without the statute,” (quoting *Sterk v. Redbox Automated Retail, LLC*, 770 F.3d 618, 623 (7th Cir. 2014))). For this reason, and to encourage consumers to bring FDCPA actions, Congress authorized an award of statutory damages for violations. 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a).

30. Moreover, Congress has explicitly described the FDCPA as regulating “abusive practices” in debt collection. 15 U.S.C. §§ 1692(a) – 1692(e). Any person who receives a debt

collection letter containing a violation of the FDCPA is a victim of abusive practices. *See* 15 U.S.C. §§ 1692(e) (“It is the purpose of this subchapter to eliminate abusive debt collection practices by debt collectors, to insure that those debt collectors who refrain from using abusive debt collection practices are not competitively disadvantaged, and to promote consistent State action to protect consumers against debt collection abuses”).

31. Misrepresentations of the character, amount or legal status of any debt, injure or risk injury to interests expressly protected by Congress in the FDCPA. *See Oloko v. Receivable Recovery Servs.*, 2019 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 140164 (N.D. Ill. Aug. 19, 2019); *Untershtine v. Encore Receivable Mgmt., Inc.*, 18-cv-1484 (E.D. Wis. August 9, 2019); *Richardson v. Diversified Consultants*, No. 17-cv-4047, 2019 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 118786 *10-11 (N.D. Ill. July 17, 2019) (“the receipt of a communication misrepresenting the character of the debt (here, the amount owed) is the kind of injury that Congress sought to prevent through the FDCPA. ‘Such an injury falls squarely within the ambit of what Congress gave consumers in the FDCPA: ‘a legally protected interest in certain information about debts,’ with ‘deprivation of information about one’s debt (in a communication directed to the plaintiff consumer) a cognizable injury.’” (internal citations omitted); *see also Pierre v. Midland Credit Mgmt., Inc.*, 2017 WL 1427070, at *4 (N.D. Ill. Apr. 21, 2017); *Saenz v. Buckeye Check Cashing of Illinois*, 2016 WL 5080747, at *1-2 (N.D. Ill. Sept. 20, 2016); *Bernal v. NRA Grp., LLC*, 318 F.R.D. 64, 72 (N.D. Ill. 2016) (holding that Plaintiff had standing to challenge misleading communication sent to him because the communication violated his “right to be free from such misleading communications”). Such misrepresentations may cause consumers to make incorrect decisions about their finances or make payments to incorrect parties.

32. 15 U.S.C. § 1692e generally prohibits “any false, deceptive, or misleading representation or means in connection with the collection of any debt.”

33. 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(2)(a) specifically prohibits “The false representation of— the character, amount, or legal status of any debt.

34. 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(5) specifically prohibits “the threat to take any action that cannot legally be taken or that is not intended to be taken.”

35. 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(10) specifically prohibits the “use of any false representation or deceptive means to collect or attempt to collect any debt.”

36. 15 U.S.C. § 1692f generally prohibits “unfair or unconscionable means to collect or attempt to collect any debt.”

The WCA

37. The Wisconsin Consumer Act (“WCA”) was enacted to protect consumers against unfair, deceptive, and unconscionable business practices and to encourage development of fair and economically sound practices in consumer transactions. Wis. Stat. § 421.102(2).

38. The Wisconsin Supreme Court has favorably cited authority finding that the WCA “goes further to protect consumer interests than any other such legislation in the country,” and is “probably the most sweeping consumer credit legislation yet enacted in any state.” *Kett v. Community Credit Plan, Inc.*, 228 Wis. 2d 1, 18 n.15, 596 N.W.2d 786 (1999) (citations omitted).

39. To further these goals, the Act’s protections must be “liberally construed and applied.” Wis. Stat. § 421.102(1); *see also* § 425.301.

40. “The basic purpose of the remedies set forth in Chapter 425, Stats., is to induce compliance with the WCA and thereby promote its underlying objectives.” *First Wisconsin*

Nat'l Bank v. Nicolaou, 113 Wis. 2d 524, 533, 335 N.W.2d 390 (1983). Thus, private actions under the WCA are designed to both benefit consumers whose rights have been violated and also competitors of the violators, whose competitive advantage should not be diminished because of their compliance with the law.

41. To carry out this intent, the WCA provides Wisconsin consumers with an array of protections and legal remedies. The Act contains significant and sweeping restrictions on the activities of those attempting to collect debts. *See* Wis. Stats. § 427.104.

42. The Act limits the amounts and types of additional fees that may be charged to consumers in conjunction with transactions. Wis. Stats. § 422.202(1). The Act also provides injured consumers with causes of action for class-wide statutory and actual damages and injunctive remedies against defendants on behalf of all customers who suffer similar injuries. *See* Wis. Stats. §§ 426.110(1); § 426.110(4)(e). Finally, “a customer may not waive or agree to forego rights or benefits under [the Act].” Wis. Stat. § 421.106(1).

43. Consumers’ WCA claims under Wis. Stat. § 427.104(1) are analyzed using the same methods as claims under the FDCPA. Indeed, the WCA itself requires that the court analyze the WCA “in accordance with the policies underlying a federal consumer credit protection act,” including the FDCPA. Wis. Stat. § 421.102(1).

44. Further, the Wisconsin Supreme Court has held that WCA claims relating to debt collection are to be analyzed under the “unsophisticated consumer” standard. *Brunton v. Nuvel Credit Corp.*, 785 N.W.2d 302, 314-15. In *Brunton*, the Wisconsin Supreme Court explicitly adopted and followed the “unsophisticated consumer” standard, citing and discussing *Gammon v. GC Servs. Ltd. P’ship*, 27 F.3d 1254, 1257 (7th Cir. 1994). *Id.*

45. Wis. Stat. § 427.104(1)(g) states that a debt collector may not: "Communicate with the customer or a person related to the customer with such frequency of at such unusual hours or in such a manner as can reasonably be expected to threaten or harass the customer."

46. Wis. Stat. § 427.104(1)(h) states that a debt collector may not: "Engage in other conduct . . . in such a manner as can reasonably be expected to threaten or harass the customer."

47. Wis. Stat. § 427.104(1)(L) states that a debt collector may not: "Threaten action against the customer unless like action is taken in regular course or is intended with respect to the particular debt."

COUNT I – FDCPA

48. Plaintiff incorporates by reference as if fully set forth herein the allegations contained in the preceding paragraphs of this Complaint.

49. Count I is brought in the alternative of Count II.

50. If Halsted and/or the creditor did not report Plaintiff's alleged debt to any CRA between sending Exhibits A & B, the representation included in Exhibit A that "a negative credit report reflecting on your credit record may be submitted to a credit reporting agency if you fail to fulfill the terms of your credit obligations" constitutes a false, deceptive, and misleading threat to undertake an action neither Halsted nor the creditor intended to take.

51. Defendants violated 15 U.S.C. §§ 1692e, 1692e(5), 1692e(10), and 1692f.

COUNT II – FDCPA

52. Plaintiff incorporates by reference as if fully set forth herein the allegations contained in the preceding paragraphs of this Complaint.

53. Count II is brought in the alternative of Count I.

54. If Halsted and/or the creditor did report the alleged debt to a CRA, the representation included in Exhibit B that “a negative credit report reflecting on your credit record may be submitted to a credit reporting agency if you fail to fulfill the terms of your credit obligations” constitutes a false, deceptive, and misleading representation as to the character and legal status of such debt because the unsophisticated consumer would understand such a representation to indicate that a negative credit report could be avoided if they tendered payment as demanded by the subsequent letter.

55. Defendants violated 15 U.S.C. §§ 1692e, 1692e(2)(A), 1692e(10), and 1692f.

COUNT III – WCA

56. Plaintiff incorporates by reference as if fully set forth herein the allegations contained in the preceding paragraphs of this Complaint.

57. Count III is brought in the alternative of Count IV.

58. If Halsted and/or the creditor did not report Plaintiff’s alleged debt to any CRA between sending Exhibits A & B, the representation included in Exhibit A that “a negative credit report reflecting on your credit record may be submitted to a credit reporting agency if you fail to fulfill the terms of your credit obligations” constitutes a false, deceptive, and misleading threat to undertake an action neither Halsted nor the creditor intended to take.

59. Defendant violated Wis. Stat. §§ 427.104(1)(g), 427.104(1)(h), and 427.104(1)(L).

COUNT IV – WCA

60. Plaintiff incorporates by reference as if fully set forth herein the allegations contained in the preceding paragraphs of this Complaint.

61. Count IV is brought in the alternative of Count III.

62. If Halsted and/or the creditor did report the alleged debt to a CRA, the representation included in Exhibit B that “a negative credit report reflecting on your credit record may be submitted to a credit reporting agency if you fail to fulfill the terms of your credit obligations” could reasonably be expected to harass the customer.

63. Defendant violated Wis. Stat. §§ 427.104(1)(g), 427.104(1)(h).

CLASS ALLEGATIONS

64. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of a Class, consisting of (a) all natural persons in the State of Wisconsin (b) who were sent a series of two or more collection letters by Halsted in the form of Exhibit A and/or Exhibit B to the complaint, (c) seeking to collect an alleged debt that was incurred for personal, family, or household purposes, (d) between November 18, 2018 and November 18, 2019, inclusive (e) that was not returned by the postal service.

65. The Class is so numerous that joinder is impracticable. Upon information and belief, there are more than 50 members of the Class.

66. There are questions of law and fact common to the members of the class, which common questions predominate over any questions that affect only individual class members. The predominant common question is whether Exhibit A violates the FDCPA and/or the WCA.

67. Plaintiff’s claims are typical of the claims of the Class members. All are based on the same factual and legal theories.

68. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately represent the interests of the Class members. Plaintiff has retained counsel experienced in consumer credit and debt collection abuse cases.

69. A class action is superior to other alternative methods of adjudicating this dispute. Individual cases are not economically feasible.

JURY DEMAND

70. Plaintiff hereby demands a trial by jury.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff requests that the Court enter judgment in favor of Plaintiff and the Class and against Defendants for:

- (a) actual damages;
- (b) statutory damages;
- (c) attorneys' fees, litigation expenses and costs of suit; and
- (d) such other or further relief as the Court deems proper.

Dated: November 18, 2019.

ADEMI & O'REILLY, LLP

By: /s/ Mark A. Eldridge
John D. Blythin (SBN 1046105)
Mark A. Eldridge (SBN 1089944)
Jesse Fruchter (SBN 1097673)
Ben J. Slatky (SBN 1106892)
3620 East Layton Avenue
Cudahy, WI 53110
(414) 482-8000
(414) 482-8001 (fax)
jblythin@ademilaw.com
meldridge@ademilaw.com
jfruchter@ademilaw.com
bslatky@ademilaw.com